REMARKS

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to Claim 24 because of an informality. However, it is believed that the amendment of Claim 24 renders the objection moot.

35 USC 112, Second Paragraph: Claims 16 and 17

The Examiner rejected Claims 16 and 17 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention. In explaining this rejection, the Examiner indicated that the unit "litres per hectare" used in Claims 16 and 17 is not a rate. The Examiner asserted that the term "rate" means a degree or unit per time and the claims recite a unit per area, thereby rendering the claims to be indefinite.

The Examiner's objection is not based on substantial evidence and is clearly erroneous. Attached to this response is an excerpt from *The New Lexicon Webster's Dictionary of the English Language* which shows the definition of the term "rate" as "the amount of something in relation to some other thing." The entry also provides the following usage example: "absentee rate of 3 men and 5 women per 1,000 employees".

In view of the well-known definition and well-accepted usage of the term "rate" evidenced by the attached dictionary excerpt, the Examiner's limited definition of "rate" is clearly erroneous. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 16 and 17 under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112 is not supported by substantial evidence and should be withdrawn.

35 USC 102(b): Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 14, 20-21, 24, 25-27, 29, and 35

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 14, 20-21, 24, 25-27, 29, and 35 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,297,730 (Thompson). In making this rejection the Examiner asserted that Thompson anticipates the rejected claims because it discloses a method for killing weeds using heat and a liquid component.

The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 1 includes the steps of exposing weeds to heat and then immediately applying a liquid substance that includes an herbicide or a fish-derived or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 24 includes the steps of exposing weeds to be killed to heat, and then immediately applying a liquid herbicide or a fish or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 35 includes the steps of exposing weeds to be killed to heat, and then immediately applying oil onto the heated weeds. Thus, in the Applicant's claimed method heat is applied first, and then the herbicide or other substance is applied. In contrast, the process described in Thompson preheats an herbicidal liquid and then applies the heated liquid to the weeds or other vegetation. Therefore, the method described in Thompson is not the same as the Applicant's claimed method.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8, 14, 20, and 21 depend from Claim 1 and thus, include all of the steps and features set forth in Claim 1. Claims 25-27, and 29 depend from Claim 24 and thus, include all of the steps set forth in Claim 24. In view of the differences between Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 14, 20-21, 24, 25-27, 29, and 35 and the process described in Thompson, it is clear that the Applicant's claimed process is novel relative to Thompson. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 14, 20-21, 24, 25-27, 29, and 35 under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn.

35 USC 102(b): Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 18, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, and 35

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 18, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, and 35 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US 2001/0000554 (Prull). In making this rejection the Examiner asserted that Prull anticipates the rejected claims because it discloses a method for killing weeds using heat and a liquid component.

The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 1 includes the steps of exposing weeds to heat and then immediately applying a liquid substance containing an herbicide or fish-derived or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 24 includes the steps of exposing weeds to be killed to heat, and then immediately applying a liquid herbicide or a fish- or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. The

Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 35 includes the steps of exposing weeds to be killed to heat, and then immediately applying oil onto the heated weeds. Thus, in the Applicant's claimed method, heat is applied first and then the herbicidal substance is applied. In contrast, the process described in Prull applies water to the weeds and then applies high heat to the moistened weeds. Therefore, the method described in Prull is not the same as the Applicant's claimed method as set forth in any of Claims 1, 24, or 35.

To the extent that the Examiner is relying on Prull's description of the secondary water sprayer, such reliance is misplaced. Prull clearly teaches that the secondary sprayer is for the purpose of preventing fires and thus, is only used as needed for such purpose. Prull neither describes nor suggests that water provided from the secondary sprayer provides any weed killing functionality. Moreover, the Examiner's assertion that water is an herbicide in the context of the Prull disclosure is unreasonable. Considered as a whole, Prull teaches the use of heat to kill weeds. In the process described in Prull, the weeds are pre-wetted with water to enhance heat transfer. The water itself has no herbicidal function. The Examiner's position is patently unreasonable because if water were an herbicide no vegetation would survive a rainstorm.

In any event, Claim 35 includes the step of applying oil to the weeds immediately after the heating step. Prull does not describe or suggest such a step.

Claims 3, 5, 8, 18, 21, and 22 depend from Claim 1 and thus, include all of the steps set forth in Claim 1. Claims 26 and 28 depend from Claim 24 and thus, include all of the steps set forth in Claim 24. In view of the differences between Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 18, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, and 35 and the process described in Prull, it is clear that the Applicant's claimed process is novel relative to Prull. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 18, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, and 35 under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn.

35 USC 102(b): Claims 1-4, 6-8, 16-22, 24-27, 29, and 30

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6-8, 16-22, 24-27, 29, and 30 under 35 USC 102(b) as

being anticipated by US 5,946,851 (Adey et al.). In making the rejection the Examiner stated, in pertinent part, "Adey et al. disclose a method for killing weeds using hot air. The temperature for killing the weeds ranges from 100°C to 900°C (col. 2, lines 19-22). The hot air is added to the weeds followed immediately by the water to inhibit burning or flaming of the weeds foliage. Alternatively, the heated water may be added to the foliage followed by heating with water."

The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 1 includes the steps of exposing weeds to heat and then immediately applying a liquid substance that includes an herbicide or a fish- or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 24 includes the steps of exposing weeds to be killed to heat, and then immediately applying a liquid herbicide or a fish- or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. Thus, in the Applicant's claimed method heat is applied first, and then the herbicide or other substance is applied. In contrast, the process described in Adey et al. applies water to the weeds simultaneously with the application of heat. Therefore, the method described in Adey et al. is not the same as the Applicant's claimed method.

Moreover, the Examiner's assertions do not fairly describe the process of Adey et al. The relevant text is set forth at column 1, line 28, to column 2, line 15, and at column 2, line 46, to column 3, line 8. It is clear from that text that the process described in Adey et al. involves simultaneous application of heat and moisture, contrary to the Examiner's assertions. Moreover, Adey et al. does not describe the use of an herbicide after the weeds are heated. As discussed above, the Examiner's assertion that water is an herbicide is unreasonable. Considered as a whole, Adey et al. teaches the use of heat to kill weeds. In the process described in Adey et al., the weeds are wetted simultaneously with water to enhance heat transfer. The water itself has no herbicidal function. As noted previously, the Examiner's position is patently unreasonable because if water were an herbicide no vegetation would survive a rainstorm.

Claims 2-4, 6-8, and 16-18, 21, and 22 depend from Claim 1 and thus, include all of the steps set forth in Claim 1. Claims 19 and 20 have been cancelled, thereby mooting the rejection as to those claims. Claims 25-27, 29, and 30 depend from Claim 24 and thus, include all of the

steps set forth in Claim 24. In view of the differences between Claims 1-4, 6-8, 16-18, 21, 24-27, 29, and 30 and the process described in Adey et al., it is clear that the Applicant's claimed process is novel relative to Adey et al. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-8, 16-18, 21, 24-27, 29, and 30 under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn.

35 USC 103(a): Claims 15 and 36

The Examiner rejected Claims 15 and 36 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of US 2,867,519 (Bartlett et al.). In making the rejection the Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to use an herbicidal grease composition as described by Bartlett et al. in the process described in Thompson.

Claim 15 depends from Claim 1 indirectly through Claim 14. Therefore, Claim 15 is interpreted to include all of the steps and features set forth in Claim 1. As discussed hereinabove, the Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 1 includes the steps of exposing weeds, or other matter to be killed, to heat and then immediately thereafter applying a liquid substance that includes an herbicide or a fish-derived or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. Thus, Claim 15 is directed to the Applicant's claimed process wherein the liquid substance includes a fish oil. Claim 36 is a dependent claim that refers back to Claim 35 and includes all of the steps and features of that claim. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 35 includes the steps of exposing weeds to be killed to heat, and then immediately applying oil onto the heated weeds. Thus, in both Claims 15 and 36 the Applicant's claimed method requires that heat is applied first, and then the herbicidal substance is applied.

In contrast, the process described in Thompson preheats the herbicidal liquid and then applies the heated liquid to the weeds or other vegetation. Therefore, even if the herbicidal composition described in Bartlett et al. were used in the process described in Thompson, the resulting process would not be the same as the Applicant's claimed method as set forth in either Claim 15 or Claim 36. Since the proposed combination would not include all of the steps and features of Claim 15 or Claim 36, the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) of those claims should be withdrawn.

35 USC 103(a): Claims 9-12 and 31-34

The Examiner rejected Claims 9-12 and 31-34 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of US 6,759,370 (Innes). In making the rejection the Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to use monterpene as described by Innes as an herbicide in the process described in Thompson.

Claims 9-12 depend from Claim 1 indirectly through Claim 8. Therefore, Claims 9-12 are interpreted to include all of the steps and features set forth in Claim 1. As discussed hereinabove, the Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 1 includes the steps of exposing weeds to heat and then immediately applying a liquid substance that includes an herbicide or a fish- or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. Thus, Claims 9-12 are directed to the Applicant's claimed process wherein the liquid substance includes a terpene-based herbicide (Claim 9), a terpene-based herbicide and a fatty acid based component (Claim 10), a terpene-based herbicide and a fatty acid soap (Claim 11), and a terpene-based herbicide, a fatty acid soap, and a foaming agent (Claim 12).

Claims 31-34 are dependent claims that refer back to Claim 24 and thus, include all of the steps and features of that claim. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 24 includes the steps of exposing weeds to be killed to heat, and then immediately applying a liquid herbicide or a fish or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claims 31-34 includes the use of a terpene-based herbicide (Claim 31), a terpene-based herbicide and a fatty acid based component (Claim 32), a terpene-based herbicide and a fatty acid soap (Claim 33), and a terpene-based herbicide, a fatty acid soap, and a foaming agent (Claim 34).

Thus, in Claims 9-12 as well as in Claims 31-34, the Applicant's claimed method requires that heat is applied first, and then the herbicide or other substance is applied.

In contrast, the process described in Thompson preheats the herbicidal liquid and then

applies the heated liquid to the weeds or other vegetation. Therefore, even if the herbicidal composition described in Innes were used in the process described in Thompson, the resulting process would not be the same as the Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claims 9-12 or in Claims 31-34. Since the proposed combination would not include all of the steps and features of Claims 9-12 or Claims 31-34, the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) of those claims should be withdrawn.

35 USC 103(a): Claims 9-12 and 31-34

The Examiner rejected Claims 9-12 and 31-34 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adey et al in view of Innes. In making the rejection the Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to use monterpene as described by Innes as an herbicide in the process described in Adey et al.

Claims 9-12 depend from Claim 1 through Claim 8. Therefore, Claims 9-12 are interpreted to include all of the steps and features set forth in Claim 1. As discussed hereinabove, the Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 1 includes the steps of exposing weed to heat and then immediately applying a liquid substance that includes an herbicide or a fish- or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. Thus, Claims 9-12 are directed to the Applicant's claimed process wherein the liquid substance includes a terpene-based herbicide (Claim 9), a terpene-based herbicide and a fatty acid based component (Claim 10), a terpene-based herbicide and a fatty acid soap (Claim 11), and a terpene-based herbicide, a fatty acid soap, and a foaming agent (Claim 12).

Claims 31-34 are dependent claims that refer back to Claim 24 and thus, include all of the steps and features of that claim. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 24 includes the steps of exposing weeds to be killed to heat, and then immediately applying a liquid herbicide or a fish or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claims 31-34 includes the use of a terpene-based herbicide (Claim 31), a terpene-based herbicide and a fatty acid based component (Claim 32), a terpene-based herbicide and a fatty acid soap (Claim 33), and a terpene-based herbicide, a fatty acid soap, and a foaming

agent (Claim 34).

Thus, in Claims 9-12 as well as in Claims 31-34, the Applicant's claimed method requires that heat is applied first, and then the herbicide or other substance is applied.

In contrast, the process described in Adey et al. applies the water simultaneously with heated air to the weeds or other vegetation. Therefore, even if the herbicidal composition described in Innes were used in the process described in Adey et al., the resulting process would not be the same as the Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claims 9-12 or in Claims 31-34. Since the proposed combination would not include all of the steps and features of Claims 9-12 or Claims 31-34, the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) of those claims should be withdrawn.

Prima facie Obviousness

The Examiner asserted that it is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is known to be useful for the same purpose. The Applicant does not believe that the references cited by the Examiner either alone or in combination render the claimed method prima facie obvious. Nevertheless, the Applicant notes that there is evidence of unexpected results presented in the present application.

An important advantage of the Applicant's claimed method is provided by the sequence in which the method is performed. As described at page 6, lines 17-20, of the present application, the Applicant believes that exposure to heat, such as the blast of hot air, breaks down the outer membrane or cellular structure of weeds so that the liquid substance which is sprayed onto the weeds immediately thereafter can more effectively penetrate into or coat the weeds. A more effective kill is achieved. Moreover, where the liquid substance is an herbicide, a substantially lower volume of the herbicide can be used which provides important economic benefits and in some cases environmental benefits through lower chemical use.

Set forth at pages 11 and 12 of the present application are the results of comparative testing of the Applicant's claimed method for killing/controlling weeds. As described therein, an

application of heat and an herbicide in accordance with the claimed method was compared to the use of heat alone and an herbicide alone. The data presented in Table 2 show that the Applicant's method was significantly more effective in preventing regrowth of the weeds up to as long as 90 days compared to the known treatments applied individually. There is no disclosure or suggestion of such an effect in any of the references cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, to the extent that a prima facie case of obviousness may be presented by the combinations of references cited by the Examiner, it is believed that the results presented in Table 2 rebut the Examiner's assertions

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of the present application in the light of the amendments and remarks presented hereinabove.

Respectfully submitted.

DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL AND SKILLMAN A Professional Corporation Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Vincent T. Pace

PTO Registration No. 31,049

Tel.: 215-563-4100 Fax: 215-563-4044 email: <u>vpace@ddhs.com</u> Attachment

THE NEW LEXICON WEBSTER'S DICTIONARY

OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

1988 EDITION

LEXICON PUBLICATIONS, INC.
NEW YORK

raster (raster) n. the part in the cathode-ray tube of a television set on which the image is

reproduced [G.=screen]
aster display (computer) a graphic presentation of data created on a screen in fixed

tion of data created on a screen in fixed sequence, use, trom left to remit vorons orders as expenses. As the remit records of the remit creat of the remit remit records of the remit rem destructive and are the carriers or many us-eases, esp. bubonic plague | (pop.) a contempt-ible person, esp. one who betrays or deserts associates | a tapered coil, esp. of hair, over which a woman's hair may be arranged || to which a woman's nair may be arrangen | to smell a rat to suspect some trap, piece of trickery, treachery sic. 2. v. pres part. rathing past and past part. rathed v.i. to hunt rats | (often with only to desert or betray one's associates

snu power of to desert or betray uses of (O.E. rez!)
(O.E. rez!)
reads reids n. either of two New Zealand trees reads reids n. either of two New Zealand fram My Accessifiers robusts and M. lucida, fam. My Accessifiers robusts and M. lucida, fam. de wood it this wood [Maori] reids water of the reids of t

[Maori]
ratable, rate-able (réitsb'l) adj. liable to be
rated | able to be rated in accordance with some
scale rata-bly, rate-ably adv.
rata-fi-a (ratafi-o) n, a liqueur flavored with al-

monds or with peach, apricot or cherry kernels [F., origin unknown]
ratel (réit'l) n. (Br.) the amount on which local

property taxes are assessed ratan *RATTAN

rat-bite fever a febrile disease caused by the bacterium Spirillum minus and transmitted by the bite of a rat. Anulcer forms at the site of the wound, the lymph glands swell, and there is usually a bluish-red rash ratch (rætf) n. a ratchet | a toothed bar with which a pawl engages to prevent reverse mo-

tion ratched (ratifit) n. a detent, catch or pawl for retaining or activating a ratchet wheel a ratchet wheel and pawl working together || (Br.) the notched, tapering teeth set on certain wheels and burs which may engage with a pawl to prevent reverse motion |F. rochet, lance head, bobbin|

et wheel a wheel having teeth with which a detent, catch or pawl engages to preven reverse motion or to activate forward motion

a deant, catch or pawl engages to prevent
as a deant, catch or pawl engages to prevent
preven motion or to activate forward motion,
reverse motion or to activate forward motion,
the some other thing, adeaster rate of 2 men
and 5 somem par 1,000 engagives [a fact cation
between two things, the state of the state of the state
and 5 somem part 1,000 engagives [a fact cation
between two things, the state of the state
and of the state of the state of the state
and cate of the state of the state
and cate of the state of the state
and cate of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state of the state
and the state of the state of the state of the state
an

"at') to deliver a sociding (stym. doubtful) rateable "ARTABLE BREET OF Mellisora, fam. rateable" ARTABLE BREET OF Mellisora, fam. sp., M. cuperso of S. Africa and M. individence, sp., M. cuperso of S. Africa and M. individence, sp., M. cuperso of S. Africa and M. individence of India, Ratele are about 3 ft long, including an B-9-in. tail, and have thick course fur, gray on top and black-thedemeath. They destroy wild be also be also be a supersonable of cellulation of the supersonable of cellulation an instrument that

rate-me-ter (réitmj:ter) n. an instrument that indicates the rate at which radiation is being

maricase the rate at which required is pering absorbed by a human rater (réitar) n. (only in compounds) a person of a certain class or rating, a second-rater rather (recor, robor) adv. mors willingly, preferably, we would rather go for a walk than stay indoors a more truthfully, more exactly, it was a

foolish rather than a malicious remark | on tl rouser reaser than a maissious remark [on the contrary, it wasn't damp, rather it was too dry in some measure, he is rather tiresome [(raber, roder) (Br., pop., in answering a question) yes, most certainly (comp. of older rathe, quickly rath-idle (retisaid) n. a chemical or other preparation for exterminating rats [fr. RAY-L. condere, to kill!

ratification (rætifikéijen) n. a ratifying or being ratified

being ratified ratified pres. part. ratifying past and past part. ratified v.t. to confirm (something done or promised), esp. formally, to ratify a treaty [F. ratifier]

ra-tine (ræti:n) n. ratiné ratiné (ræt'néi) n. a coarse woolen, cotton or

rayon cloth, woven so as to have a rough, knot-ted surface [F.=tufted] rating (réitin) n. a man's class in a warship'e crew, or in the army || (Br.) a sailor below com-missioned rank || classification, e.g. of engines missioned rank || classification, e.g. of engines by horsepower, yachts by tonnage etc. || Com-merce) the estimated credit and reliability of a business concern || an estimate of achievement, status etc. || (Br.) the amount fixed as a rate to

status etc. [UPr] the amount meet as a rate to be paid on projection) in. the relation between two quantities which is expressed by dividing the magnitude of one by that of the other, the ratio between selling price and one price is 3 in IL.—reason relationship price and cost price is 3 in Techno-relation of the project in the project of the project in the project and purp part, revision-in-abed colorist (project and purp part, revision-in-abed colorist (project and purp part, revision-in-abed colorist (project and purp part, revision-in-abed

ocinari (ratiocinatus)] ra-ti-oci-na-tion (rmfi:psinéifan) n. (rhet.) the reasoning process [fr. L. ratiocinatio (ratiocina-

a-ti-oc-i-na-tive (ræfi:ńsineitiv) adj. (rhet.) of or marked by ratiocination [fr. L. ratiocinatira-ti-oc

or instrace vy. resident [1] an an amount (of food, time etc.) which one permits oneself or which one is permitted [(st.) provisions (sep. of food or drink) alloited 2. st. to fix the amount of (someonesume) to allow to consume the allow to consume the armount of someonesume to allow to consume only a certain amount of something [(with out) to give out as vatice [F or fr. L. ratio (variouts), alloid (variouts), and other consumed to the consumer of the consu

a ration [F. or fr. L. ratio (rationis), ratio]
rational (rationis) adj. of or relating to reason [
based on and in accordance with reason or reasoning | well suited to its purpose, rational dress | endowed with reason, man is a rational animal | (pop.) sensible, sound-minded | (math.) not requiring a radical for its expression [fr. L.

rationale (refentl) n. the logical justifying rationale (r = lant1) n, the logical justifying grounds for something 1 a statement or exposition of principles or reasons [L. neut. of rationalls, rational] rationalls n (reformized) n, the belief that

rationalism (rajanijzem) h. the belief that all knowledge and truth consist in what is ascertainable by rational processes of thought and that there is no supernatural revelation [(philos.) the doctrine that true and absolute knowledge is found only in reason rationalist adj. and h. rationalistic adj.

adi, and n. redionel/relico adj.
redionel/relico adj.
redionel/reliconel/rel

weuterings | 1 to make (a production or an industry) more efficient and less cost) | [math.) to reduce (an expression) to finite terms Rekis-bon (rétizeon) "RECENSURO rabile (rétait) 1. adj. of a member of Ratitae, a group of fighless, running birde with a fiat staraum and rudimentary wings (e.g. emu, ostrob) 2. n. a member of Ratitae (tr. L ratis, tr. a member of Ratitae (tr. L ratis, tr. a member of Ratitae) (tr. a raft)

ratij rabline (rattin) n. (naut., esp. pl.) one of the small lines rope across the shrouds of a chip, forming a ladder || the thin rope so used || mil.) an organizaci effort for clandestine movement of personnel and/or material across a denied area

or border [etym: doubtful]
rato-morphic (retamorfik) adj. research conclusions based on the reactions of rats

ration, ration (ration) 1. n. a new shoot growing from the root or crown of a perennial, e.g. sugarcane, after the old growth has been

cut down 2. v.i. to send up new shoots in this way | v.f. to cut back (a plant) to encourage rations to sprout [fr. Span. retolo, a sprout] rat race (pop.) a heetic rush, frantic scramble (used esp. of the struggle to earn a living in an industrial economy under conditions which tend to dehumanize) rat racer n. (colloq.) participant in competitive

society ratian, ratan (ratian) n. any of various climb-ing palma, eep. of genera Calamus and Dac-monothops, growing in India and S.E. Asia | a part of the long stem of this plant used for wickerwork, chair seats, rope etc. || a walking stick fashioned from such a stem [Malay rotan fr.

habloned from such a seem blainy roles of reduct, to paral paster (relate) n. a dag good at catching rate reduct, to paral paster (relate) n. a dag good at catching rate paster (relate) n. a dag good at catching rate catching rate catching rate days and reduced to the relater of the reduction of abort, sharp sounds, the shutter rattled in the useful to move entitled such sentiting such sounds, the old our rattled along or great preed (othen with ea) to rate the catching sound (othen with tipp) to make in the reduction of the re clogged throat || a contrivance or baby's toy designed to make this sound || the horny ringe on a rattlesnake's tail [M.E. ratelen, prob. imit.]

rabile-brain (ræt'lbrein) n. an emptyheaded person rabile-brained adj. rabiler (rætler) n. a rattlesnake

rabtle-snake (ræt'lsneik) n. a member of Sis-trurus or Crotalus, fam. Crotalidas, genera of North American poisonous snakes having horny sheaths towards the end of the tail which

horny sheaths towards the end of the tall whine make a ratifuling sound ratificating old and dilapidated, see, a noley ratifing automobile, wagon etc. [15r., old-fash.) someone who chat-ter incessantly 2. adj. old and dilapidated ratifing (rettin) adj. (pop) decidedly good, or attling success [10pp.] lively, hrisk, a ratifing

rat-tly (rætli:) adj. tending to rattle | having a noisy sound like a rattle rattoon *RATOON

rat-trap, rat-trap (rættræp) n. a trap for catching rate

rau-cous (r5kee) adj. hoaree, grating, rough-sounding, raucous laughter [fr. L. raucus] raun-chy (r5nt]:) adj. bawdy —raunchiness

h. Rauschen-berg (ráufanborg), Robert (1925-), U.S. painter, known esp. for his 'combined rawings depicting themes drawn from American folklore and using a juxtaposition of callage, ink, pencil and photography rawage (rávidy) a. devusstation | (pl.) ill effects, the ranucase of time [F].

the runques of time [F.] reveage res, nor reverging past and post part, reveaged v.t. to lay wasts to || v.t. to do part, reveaged v.t. to lay wasts to || v.t. to do reverged v.t. v.t. pres, part, reverged post and past part, rawed to talk or set widely or incoher-settly, he roud in his delirum; (with about or restly, he roud in his delirum; (with about or tim, he rever about that ringer || v.t. to express wildy or incoherently, to runce obscribe 2. a. the set of raving or an instance of this || (pop.) and recessingly withoutselfs or trition, page of a play recessingly withoutselfs or trition, page of a play

szocasiwy enfusiastic criticism, esp. of a play perio. O. F. neuro. perio. O. P. neuro. perio. O. P. neuro. perio. O. P. neuro. perio. Perio. Perio. Perio. Perio. composer. He explored a highly chromatic and enanuous harmony. His art is repressely per-fix mer l'Oye' (1988) and the operas Tifueur expagnole (1970) and Tefanta et as estriblese (completed in 1995. His mastery of corbitation period. and Chlord (1996.) is almost other works in-clude the plane suite Caspard de la nut'

songs ravel (ravel) 1. v. pres. part ravel-ling, esp. Br. ravel-ling part. and past part. raveled, esp. Br. ravelled v.t. to separate the threads of lib cause (the edge of a fabric) to fray || v.t. to become tangled or confused | to become un-twisted || to fray 2. n. a frayed end or loose thread || comething tangled, esp. a tangled situ-

CONCISE PRONUNCIATION KEY: (a) z, cat; a, car; a fawn; ei, snake. (e) e, hem; i:, sheep; ia, deer; ca, bear. (l) i, fish; ai, tiger; ac, bird. (o) o, car; au, cow; ou, goat; u, poor; ai, royal. (u) A, duck; u, bull; u; goose; a, beallius; ju; cube. x, loch; 6, hinh; 8, bother; x, Zen; 3, corsage; dy, awage; 0, orangulang; j, yak; j, fuh; if, fach, T, rabble; n, radden. Complete pronunciation key appears inside front cover.